



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

MOHAMMEDAN CRITICISM OF THE BIBLE.

THE attitude of the Moslim Church towards the Bible cannot be better seen than in the following abstract from one of the most renowned Arabic works on *Religious Sects and Denominations*. It is an attempt to interpret Deut. xxxiii. 2, and reads thus¹ :—

It is said in the Torah, that God arrived from mount Sinai, appeared in Sāir, and revealed himself in Fārān. Sāir stands for the hills in Jerusalem where Jesus preached, whilst Fārān signifies the heights of Mecca where the chosen prophet (Mohammed) declared himself. Since the divine secrets and heavenly lights which accompany inspiration, revelation, divine promptings and their interpretation led up to the three stages of commencement, continuation, and completion, and since "arrival" corresponds most closely to the commencement, appearing to continuation, and "revelation" to completion: the Torah expresses the dawn of law-giving, and its proclamation by employing the phrase of coming upon mount Sinai, and the rising of the sun by the appearance (of Jesus) on Sāir, whilst the third stage, viz. completion, is reached through the revelation on Fārān.

By means of this allegory Al Shahrastāni wishes to convey that Judaism and Christianity led up to a climax which is Islām. The character of Islām as the embodiment of the two preceding religions is therefore predicted in the Bible which thus becomes obsolete.

Now the Qorān already distinguishes between the Law as revealed on Sinai, and the Bible as it was found in the hands of the Jews, or rather as Mohammed reconstructed it from the religious practices he observed among them.

¹ Al Shahrastāni, *Kitāb al milal wa'nihāl*, ed. Cureton, I, p. 165 sq.

Wishing to uphold the divine origin of the Torah without incurring any liability as to its ritual laws, he declared that it had been tampered with by the Rabbis, who by making new laws aspired to divine honours¹. On this account he sought to prove that a heathen element had crept into the Jewish Church. The inconsistency of introducing Rabbinic regulations into the doctrines of Islām is due to his lack of authentic knowledge of the Jewish Scriptures, but does not concern us at this moment.

When examining Mohammed's attitude towards the Bible, one cannot help observing that it was almost the same as that of the Karaïtes. He only acknowledged as genuine what he considered to be the revealed text of the Torah, and this he took in a strictly literal sense. Those whom he held responsible for the alteration of the Law he styled *Rabbanites*², thus being actually the first to employ this term, which was used, in the same deprecatory manner later on, by the Karaïtes. Now we do not cherish any illusions as to our knowledge of the embryo life and early youth of this sect, and here I should like to call attention to one possible factor which has hitherto remained unnoticed, but which may perhaps shed a dim light on this dark period of Jewish history. The spiritual sphere of the Jewish masses was anything but wide during the time when the Talmud was nearing completion, and their knowledge of Judaism was derived from traditional practice, rather than from the study of Rabbinic writings.

On the other hand, we see Islām causing a mighty stir among the thousands of its followers. These, in their turn, represented public opinion which was, of necessity, also active among the numerous Jewish communities to be found in their midst. We need not enlarge on the influence of public opinion on people with limited capacities, because there is no difference in this respect between past and present. Among the Jews who saw the rise of Islām were many who had been converted from paganism, and who

¹ Qor. iii. 73.

² Ibid. and v. 48, 68.

had neither much religious knowledge nor strong convictions to impart to their children. In view of the strict Rabbinical interpretation of the Mosaic law, the Moham-medan way of looking at the same probably appealed to this class of people, who, without formally abandoning Judaism, endeavoured to shape it exclusively according to what they found written in the Pentateuch.

I do not, by any means, assert that Islām was the only factor which helped Karaism into existence, but it was certainly one of its agents. Great historical movements never start from one point only, but are set rolling in various ways which converge into one main road. It is hardly by accident that Karaism was born and lived the best part of its life in Moslim countries, and it is, to say the least, noteworthy that Karaïtes adopted the Qorānic term *Rabbāniyyūn* to describe, or rather denounce, the adherents of the Rabbinic code. At the time when Karaism was at its height, Arabic was the language of Karaïte authors (although it was not so much used at first), and the methods employed in all branches of scientific endeavours were those of the Arabs.

There is one point in common between Judaism and Islām, viz. that both their ritual and civil codes are portions of their respective religious laws. The rules for interpreting ordinations developed in the Talmud are in some way paralleled by a few similar ones employed by Moslim theologians. Where the Qorān and the oldest strata of tradition gave no clue for the solution of certain ritual or legal questions, they had recourse to the *ra'y* (speculative deduction of decisions), or to the *qiyās* (analogy), or *taqlīd* (adoption of another teacher's opinion in case of doubt). This system not being so well worked out as the process of Talmudic discussion, left too much room for individual conceptions on the part of the Mufti. It did not take long, therefore, ere a reaction set in. In the third century of the Hijra, a school was founded in the *Irāq* (Babylon), which rejected all indirect deduction, and returned to the Qorān

and the oldest tradition. The school bears the name of the *Zāhirites*¹, i.e. those who explained the sacred word according to its literal meaning, and a full account of its history and doctrines has been given by Professor Goldziher².

As one can easily perceive, there is a certain resemblance between the Zāhirite movement and the endeavours of the Karaïtes. It is, however, very difficult to say whether Karaïte influence on Moslim theology was such as to promote Zāhirism, or whether the latter arose spontaneously, both being brought into existence by common impulses. It must be noted that both reached their apogees at about the same period, and spread from their original homes as far as Spain.

It was in this country that Zāhirism attained its utmost limits by finally including even dogmatic principles in its teachings. It was thus brought into direct conflict with the fundamental axioms of the Bible, which could not be overridden by the simple process of abrogation, as was the case with ritual observances. The man who first applied the Zāhirite method to the Bible was *Abu Mohammed Ali*, better known as *Ibn Ḥazm al-Zāhiri*³. He was a native of Cordova, and born in 994, only one year after Samuel b. Nagrela, who was a native of the same town.

Now the name of Samuel b. Nagrela is sufficient to remind us that at this period Cordova was one of the foremost centres of Jewish learning. Famous men were on the increase. Ḥisdai b. Shafrut, Menaḥem, and Dūnash had just died, but besides these, such men as Moses b. Ḥanōkh, Josef b. Abitur, Jahuda Ḥayyūj brought renown to the city. In spite of his fanaticism, Ibn Ḥazm was

¹ The main doctrine of the Zāhirite is expressed *in nuce* in the following words by Ibn Ḥazm (fol. 72^{vo}): "We acknowledge in our religion nothing but what is contained in the Qorān, or what is founded on reliable and trustworthy tradition, as being taught by the messenger of Allāh. Everything else we regard as of no account."

² *Die Zahiriten und ihr Lehrsystem*, Leipzig, 1884.

³ See Ibn Khallikān, *Biographical Dictionary*, transl. by de Slarfe, II, p. 267 sqq., cf. Goldziher, *l. c.*, p. 116 sqq.

in constant intercourse with learned Jews, and recorded several discussions he had with them. He makes special mention of *Josef b. Abdallāh, Kādhi* (or *Dayyān*) of Cordova¹, whose Hebrew name was probably Josef b. Obadyāh. On another occasion he alludes to "a person well read in Hebrew," with whom he conversed on the etymology of the name Israel². A third discussion with a Jewish authority will be noticed later on.

Mohammedan biographers record among Ibn Ḥazm's writings a treatise *Exposure of the alterations* (in the Bible) *made by Jews and Christians*³. This is, however, but a special title given to the first section of his large work entitled *Book of Religions and Denominations*, of which several MS. copies are in existence. It is from this work that the following observations are taken, but I have only selected such as refer to the Old Testament.

Before discussing them we will briefly consider the scope and method of Ibn Ḥazm. His object in criticizing the Bible was to substantiate the charges brought by Mohammed against Jews (and Christians) of falsifying their holy Writs. His strict way of interpreting the Qorān led him to take this accusation in its literal sense, and he therefore thought he was but fulfilling a religious duty in pointing out those passages in the Bible where the advent of Mohammed had been foretold, or those verses which appear to contradict one another, or seemed to be opposed to absolute monotheism.

Each passage of the Bible to which Ibn Ḥazm attaches his criticism is preceded by a literal Arabic translation, or by the interpolation of part of a verse in his reasonings. The question now arises whence did he take his translation? In the majority of passages he evidently followed Saadyah's version, but in others he did not do so. To the latter class belong his versions of Exod. xv⁴ (beginning only) and

¹ Fol. 36^{vo}.

² Fol. 19^{ro}, see App., No. IV.

³ Ibn Khall., *ibid.*, Ḥāji Khālifah, I, p. 346 (No. 888).

⁴ See App., No. V.

Deut. xxxii¹, and it is not unlikely that these were translated for him by one of his Jewish friends in Cordova. But even in many verses taken from Saadyah he did not adopt his translation blindly, but changed many paraphrastic renderings (especially of anthropomorphistic passages) for more literal ones.

I here give a small selection of such passages:—

	SAADYAH.	IBN ḤAZM.
Gen. iv. 15.	Vengeance multiplied.	Vengeance sevenfold.
„ vi. 2.	The sons of the great.	The sons of God.
„ vi. 3.	My self.	My spirit.
„ xviii. 3.	O friend of God.	My Lord.
„ xxv. 23.	The fathers of two nations.	Two nations.
„ xxxii. 27.	When the day broke he said unto him, let me go.	And he said, let me go, for the day breaketh.
„ xxxii. 31.	I have seen the angel of the Lord.	I have seen God.

As regards proper nouns, Ibn Ḥazm, like Saadyah, retains their Hebrew spelling, excepting those for which Arabic forms were given in the Qorān or in later works. His system of transliteration into Arabic characters is, however, not quite consistent, as in a few cases he attempted phonetic spelling, as in كوهين, where he replaced *šērē* by an inserted *yōdh*. Writing as he did for learned Arab theologians, the language of his translations is, on the whole, purer than Saadyah's, whose chief aim was to provide a Targum for Arabic-speaking Jews.

Ibn Ḥazm was so convinced that the Bible, as he read it, had been tampered with by the Rabbis, that he reviled it continually, and only spoke of it with scorn. On more

¹ Published by M. Schreiner, *Semitic Studies* (in memory of Dr. Kohut), p. 499 sq.

than one occasion he alluded to it in such terms as "the changed and altered book," or even "the cursed book." The following argument is taken from the introduction to his *Book of Religions and Denominations*¹."

Says Abu Mohammed: The first point is that in the hands of the Samaritans there is a Torah which is not the same which is in the hands of the other Jews. They (the Samaritans) assert that theirs had been revealed to Moses, and point out that the one in the hands of the other Jews is changed and altered. A Samaritan (Codex of the) Torah does not come into our hands, because they do not allow it to go out of Palestine and (the land of) the Jordan. Yet we know that their Torah teaches that from Adam's dismissal from the Garden of Eden to the time of the Flood there elapsed 1367 years, whilst the Torah which is in the hands of the Rabbanites and Ananites gives 1650 for the same period, and the Torah which the seventy Elders of the Jewish Rabbis translated for King Ptolemy, which the Christians also use as authority, states that from the dismissal of Adam from the Garden of Eden to the Flood there elapsed 2242 years. Another Torah belonging to one section of the Jews gives 657 years and eight months, less eight days.

We cannot place much reliance on the correctness of the figures in our MS., so that it is rather difficult to find out the sources from which Ibn Ḥazm drew them. The last number 657 is evidently a mistake for 1657, the copyist having omitted the word *alf* (thousand). This number would be nearly identical with the 1650 mentioned above, as taken from the Torah, and the 1656 years given by Josephus and in the Midrāsh (Ber. R., Gen. xi. 1). At all events we see that Ibn Ḥazm gathered information from various Jewish sources (all of which he includes in the term Torah), and that he knew of the Septuagint and the current story of its origin. Enough discrepancies in the numbers of years given in the different Torahs, however, remained to warrant the assertion that some of them must be false.

Gen. ii. 10-14, Ibn Ḥazm² translates exactly like Saadyah, viz. that Pīshōn is "the Nile which encircles the whole

¹ Fol. 2^{ro}; see App., No. I.

² Fol. 2^{ro}.

country of *Zawīla*," a country supposed by Arab geographers to be situated in the Sūdān¹. Now the next verse states that the Jihān surrounds the whole country of Ḥabesh, but, says Ibn Ḥazm, there is no other stream in this whole territory except the Nile. Consequently God cannot have said that the Nile surrounds *Zawīla*, whilst the Jihān encompasses Ḥabesh, because the latter river has its sources in Rūm (probably Asia Minor), and flows into the Mediterranean Sea. Another objection made by Ibn Ḥazm is that there are no pearls (*b'dōlah*) to be found in *Zawīla*, but only in the Persian and Indian seas, and in the rivers of India and China.

Of special interest are those passages in which Mohammedan readers of the Bible, and Ibn Ḥazm in particular, fancied they had discovered polytheistic leanings. These were solely due to Rabbinic corruptions, and Ibn Ḥazm criticizes them in most acrimonious terms. I shall only discuss three of these, viz. Gen. iii. 22 ("man is become one of *us*"), vi. 2 ("the sons of Elohim"), and Exod. iv. 22 ("Israel is my son, even my firstborn").

In his criticism of the first of these verses, Ibn Ḥazm observes that it has led many of the best Jews to believe in an intermediate deity². It is unmistakable that in the words "best of the Jews" he alludes to Philo, whose theology he describes as senseless heresy. In his notes on Gen. vi. 2, Ibn Ḥazm criticizes "one of their sages of the past," who explains the words "sons of Elohim" by "angels." Such, however, is Saadyah's translation, and there can therefore be no doubt that Ibn Ḥazm had this in his mind³.

Now this touches one of the chief points of contention between Mohammedan and Jewish interpreters of the anthropomorphistic passages of the Bible. The Qorān avoids divine attributes, such as "Father," "Man of war," "Rock," or "Fountain of living waters," and only on one

¹ Cf. Yācūt, ed. Wüstenfeld, II, p. 170.

² See App., No. II.

³ Ibid., No. III.

occasion did Mohammed give way so far as to call Allāh "Light of the heavens and the earth¹." He could not, however, dispense with the subordinate anthropomorphism, and described God as speaking, writing, sitting on his throne which is borne by angels, and even as cunning². Mohammedan theologians were at first not a little embarrassed by such expressions, but finally had the good sense to explain them as based on imbued doctrines which were not to be taken literally. The Zāhirites, too, were forced to take them in an allegorical sense, although this was inconsistent with their teachings (App., No. V).

Before dealing with Ibn Ḥazm's criticism of Exod. iv. 22, I should here like to draw attention to the remarks attached to the same verse by one of the brightest Arab littérateurs of a much earlier epoch. This was Amr b. Baḥr AlJāḥiz, who lived in Basra, and died in 868. It is exceedingly interesting to observe that not only had this man already studied the Bible in an Arabic version, but to judge from one mistranslated passage³, seems to have tried to translate from the original itself. As he lived one hundred years before Saadyah, the few specimens of his renditions into Arabic of Biblical verses are the oldest we possess, and occur in an epistolar treatise styled *Refutation of Christianity*.

The abstract runs as follows :—

They (the Christians) say : In the Torah the words "Israel is my firstborn" are to be found, and all that you mention as emanating from us occurs in the books (of the Bible), as is well known.

My answer is : On account of their scant knowledge of the different meanings of speech, and their bad and injudicious translation, the people employed terms which appealed to their minds. Had they possessed the minds of Moslims, and the knowledge of what the Arabic language admits, as well as what terms were permissible to be applied to God, in addition to their mastery of the Hebrew tongue, they would have found a fine explanation and an easy way out [of the difficulties] of this term. If they did not deny the attributes (of

¹ Qor. xxiv. 35.

² e. g. Qor. ii. 256 ; iii. 47 ; iv. 69, &c.

³ Probably Ps. xci. 8.

God) in other passages they translate, one could criticize and attack them. They assert, however, that God said in the decalogue which the fingers of God have written: I am the Almighty, I am the strong God, I am the fire which devours the fires, taking the children for the guilt of the fathers, the first, the second, the third to the seventh generation. And David said in the Psalms: Open thine eyes, O Lord¹; stand up, O Lord², do thou for me thy hearing³, O Lord. In another place David says of God: God wakes up as wakes up the drunkard who has drunk wine⁴. Moses said in the Torah: God created the things through his word, and through the spirit of his soul⁵. God has further said in the Torah to the children of Israel: My strong arm has brought you forth from the people of Egypt. He has also said in the Book of Isaiah⁶: I praise God in a new song, I praise him in the remotest corners of the earth, the isles and their inhabitants, and the seas and the deserts and all that is therein; the children of Kedar in their castles, and the inhabitants of the mountains—viz. Kedar, the son of Ismael—shout forth and give glory and greatness to God. In the isles they clothe themselves in God's praise. He goes on saying: The Lord lives like a man of war and like a strenuous man who incites to war, pushes on, shouts and makes war, who slays his enemies. Heaven and earth rejoice. God says further in the book of Isaiah: He is silent when I am silent, like a woman in travail about to bring forth I sigh. Behold me, I will plough up the mountains and the tribes, and will take hold of the blind and lead them a way which they know not. No man of learning will tolerate the translation into Arabic of such passages, and more in the same strain. There are many more similar verses which I have omitted because thou art acquainted with them. Thou knowest that had the Jews translated the Qorān into Hebrew, they would have altered its sense and changed its aspect. Dost thou not think that, had they done so, they would have angered us, and we would have resented it? Treat carefully [phrases like]: "The heavens shall be rolled up in his right hand (Qor. xxxix. 67)," or "He settled on the throne (xx. 4)," or "[Faces on that day] shall be bright, gazing on their Lord (xcv. 22)," or "When his Lord appeared unto the mountain (vii. 139)," or "But Moses did God speak to, speaking (iv. 162)," or "Thy Lord comes with the angels rank on rank (lxxxix.

¹ This is not in the Psalms.

² Ps. cxxxii. 8.

³ *اصنع الله سمعك* is probably mistranslation of *שמע שמך*, Ps. cix. 21.

⁴ Ps. lxxviii. 65.

⁵ Ps. xxxiii. 6 with copyist's mistake, who read *نفسه* for *فمه*.

⁶ Isaiah xlii. 10 sqq.

23)." Thou knowest that the commentators of our Book and our interpreters are better informed and more learned in matters of language than the Jews and the interpreters of the books [of the Bible]. We find in their exegesis what must not be applied to God when giving him attributes, neither among the analogies of the *mutakallimūn*¹, nor in the philological endeavours of the grammarians. What canst thou do with the nonsense of the Jews and their eccentricity, their defective penetration and imitation? In this chapter the Arabs themselves and the learned linguists have erred, since their hearts erred, and their minds went astray. How much more was this the case with others who did not equal them in knowledge!

If we consider that these are the words of a man who was a Mutazilite of Mutazilites, we get a fair estimate of the manner in which the Biblical method of expressing divine attributes was regarded even by the most enlightened Moslims. There is hardly a greater contrast imaginable than between AlJāhiz and Ibn Ḥazm in matters of theology, yet the difference between them in dealing with anthropomorphisms, such as in Exod. iv. 22, is small, and chiefly marked by the more or less strong language employed. Ibn Ḥazm is shocked at the assumption of ascribing children to God, adding that this stands much below the Christian dogma of the fatherhood of God. The expressions used by him on the occasion are almost too violent for reproduction².

The following quotation illustrates more fully what, according to Ḥazm³, was the heathenish turn which Rabbinic Judaism had taken:—

All Rabbanite Jews, are destined to be united in the wrath of God and his curse. They pray⁴ on the night of Kippur, which is the tenth of Tishri in October. Then rises *Ansatrūn*⁵—which according to their opinion signifies the "minor Lord" (far from God such heresy). He stands up, tears his hair, weeps a little, and says: Woe unto me since I have destroyed my house and made my sons and

¹ Theological philosophers.

² Fol. 27^{vo}.

³ Fol. 72^{ro}.

⁴ يقولون, but probably يصلون.

⁵ Copyist's mistake for *Metatrōn*.

daughters orphans and my people upset¹. I cannot raise them up again until a prophet comes to whom I will restore my sons and daughters—and more such language. Know that they have assigned a number of days of October in which they worship a lord who is another than God. In this they arrive at sheer polytheism. You should know that the minor Lord is the one to whom they have assigned those special days to worship him beside God, is the angel *Sandalfōn*, servant of the crown which is on the head of the being they adore. This is worse than Christian heresy. I spoke to one of them on this subject, and he answered me : Metatrōn is one of the angels, &c.

It only now remains for us to inquire into the causes which, in Ibn Ḥazm's opinion, have led the Jews to fall into such grave errors. His concluding words are as follows² :—

After several hundred years some people of the house of Aaron came into power. Sacrifices ceased, copies of the Torah were multiplied and circulated in the form which the Jews now possess. Their Rabbis composed prayers for them which took the place of sacrifices. The Rabbis contrived a new religion for them ; they built Synagogues in every place in opposition to the custom upheld during their independence, more than four hundred years. They arranged gatherings every Sabbath day, as they do now, also in opposition to previous custom. For [in those times] they had in their towns no house of worship or gathering for religious purposes, nor a place for sacrifices at all, except the Temple alone, or, prior to the Temple, the Tent. This is where the difference lies.

The proof³ of this is that they admit to be stated in the Book of Joshua b. Nūn, that the children of Reuben, Gad, and half a tribe of Manasse built an altar on their return from conquering the country near the Jordan and Palestine to their own country east of the Jordan. Joshua and the rest of Israel wanted to make war against them until they sent them a message, saying : We did not build this [altar] to offer up sacrifices, nor to worship at all ; heaven forbid that we should find another place beside that one in which are the tent and the house of God. Thereupon they let them alone⁴. But apart from this there is sufficient evidence for one who has understanding that it (the Bible) is altered and full of untruth and apocryphal, as Judaism it is also an apocryphal religion in contrast to the one they confess to have received from Moses. Satan himself does not wish to

¹ Talmud Berakhōth, fol. 3^{ro}.

² Fol. 56^{ro}.

³ App., No. VI.

⁴ Joshua xxii. 9 sqq.

pursue more than this, and an error graver than this. Heaven protect us from such heresy! Furthermore, the Torah, translated by the Seventy Elders for King Ptolemy after the propagation of the Torah, which they forgot, stands in opposition to the one which Ezra the Scribe wrote down for them. The Christians hold that there are differences in the Septuagint respecting the eras with the exception of the time between Adam and Noah. On account of these differences there is an uncertainty between the era of the Jews and that of the Christians, exceeding a thousand years and more, as we will show later on. For this reason truth comes out, as well as the lie of the Seventy Elders in their endeavour to hand down what is false. These are the men who took their religion in hand.

Woe and alas to a religion taken from people whose untruth is thus established. Furthermore, in the fifth Book of the Torah, called Deuteronomy, it is stated that God said to Moses¹: Make two tablets like the first ones, and go up to the mountain, and make an ark of wood that I may write on the tablets the Ten Commandments which the Lord made you hear on the mount out of the midst of the flame, when you were gathered with him. He gave them to me, I went down from the mountain, and placed them in the ark in which they are to this day.

Such are the arguments brought forward by Mohammedan theologians and philosophers against the authenticity of the Bible. Their criticism differs considerably from what we understand by this word, because it was not historical, but dictated by a combination of dogma and *odium theologicum*. Considering that the authoritative character of this controversy gave it great weight in the eyes of a nation among which Jews only lived on sufferance, and might even have had an unfavourable influence on many less learned Jews, Jewish theologians saw the necessity of taking precautions against such teachings. Maimonides lays stress on the unaltered character of the Bible not only in the Moreh (ii. 39), but there can be no doubt that the Articles VIII and IX of his Thirteen Articles of Creed were written with the express purpose of refuting Mohammedan charges against Rabbinic alteration of the Torah, as well as the Qorānic dogma of the

¹ x. i-6.

abrogation of the Jewish law. I quote the opening passages of these two articles in translation from the Arabic original¹.

“Art. VIII teaches the heavenly origin of the Torah. This implies the belief that the whole of this Torah, as it is found in our hands to-day, is the same Torah which was revealed to Moses, and originates entirely from God.”

“Art. IX concerning Abrogation: To wit that the Law of Moses has never been abrogated, nor has there come another Law from God. Nothing was added to the Torah, nor was anything taken away from it, neither in the text nor in its interpretation.”

The object of these sentences is hardly comprehensible unless taken from the point of view of protest.

HARTWIG HIRSCHFELD.

APPENDIX.

I.

Ibn Ḥazm. Cod. Brit. Mus. Or. 842.

Fol. 2^{ro}.

فصل قال ابو محمد اَوَّل ذلك ان بأيدي السامريّة تورا غير التوراة التي بأيدي سائر اليهود ويدّعون انها المنزلة على موسى ويقطعون بأنّ التي بأيدي سائر اليهود محرّفة مبدّلة ولم تقع لنا تورا السامرية باسرها لانهم لا يستحلّون الخروج عن فلسطين والأردن الا أنّه ثبت عندنا أنّ في تورائهم أنّ من هبوط آدم عليه السلام من جنة عدن الى وقت الطوفان الف سنة وثلاث مائة سنة وسبع وستين وفي التوراة التي بأيدي الرّبّانيّة والعنانيّة أنّ من هبوط آدم عمّ من جنة عدن الى وقت الطوفان الف سنة (واحدا) وست مائة سنة وخمسين سنة وفي التوراة التي ترجم السبعون شيخاً من أبحار اليهود لبطلوس ويذكر النصارى أنّ عليها يقولون أنّ من هبوط آدم من جنة عيدن الى وقت الطوفان القى سنة (اثنين) ومائتي

¹ Pococke, *Porta Mosis*, p. 173.

عام واثنتين واربعين عاما وفى توراۃ اخرى لطائفة من اليهود أنّ من هبوط آدم عمّ من الجنة عيدن الى وقت الطوفان ستة مائة سنة وسبع وخمسين سنة وثمانية اشهر غير ثمانية أيّام

II.

Fol. 4^{vo}. Gen. iii. 22.

قال ابو محمد حكايتهن عن الله عزّ وجلّ انه قال هذا آدم قد صار كواحد ممّا مصيبة من مصائب الدهر وموجب ضرورة أنّهم آلهة أكثر من واحد ولقد أدّى هذا القول الحبيث المقيّ كثيراً من خواص اليهود الى الاعتقاد أنّ الذى خلق آدم لم يكن الا خلقا خلقه الله تعالى قبل آدم وأكل من الشجرة التى أكل منها فعرف الخير والشر ثم أكل من شجرة الحياة فصار إلهاً من جملة الآلهة نعوذ بالله من هذا الكفر الأحمق ونحمده اذ هدانا للملة الزهراء الواضحة التى نشهد سلامتها من كل داخله بأنّها من عند الله عز وجلّ

Their statement that God said: "This Adam is become as one of us" is most disastrous, since it compels people to believe that there exists more than one God. Such pernicious theory has led many of the best Jews to believe that the God who created Adam was but a created being created by God before Adam. It was this one who ate from the tree and learned to distinguish between good and evil. Afterwards he ate from the tree of life and became as one of the gods. Heaven forbid such absurd heresy, let us praise him for having guided us to the brilliant and manifest religion whose integrity from every intruding element we testify, coming as it did from God.

III.

Fol. 4^{vo}. Gen. vi. 2.

قال ابو محمد وهذا احمق وكذب اذ جعل لله تعالى أولاداً ينكحون بنات آدم وهذه مظاهرة ظاهرة تعالى الله عن ذلك حتّى أنّ بعض أسلافهم قال إنّما عنى بذلك الملائكة وهذه كذبة بلا شك لأنّ الملائكة لا يطوون النساء ولا يولدنهم وقال بعضهم إنّما عنى بذلك أولاد شيث

This is foolish and false, since they credit God with having children who married the daughters of Adam. The anthropomorphism of this is so palpable (far be it from God) that one of their own sages of the past explained it as referring to the angels only. This is, however, false beyond doubt, since angels neither associate with women nor cause them to bear children. Another explanation connects the word with the sons of Seth.

IV.

Fol. 19^{ro}. Gen. xxxii. 28.

قال له كنت قويًا على الله فكيف على الناس ولقد اخبرني بعض اهل
البصر بالعبرانية أنه لذلك سُمي اسرائيل وإيل بالعبرانية هو اسم الله تع
بلا شك فمعناه اسراً لله تذكيراً بذلك الضبط الذى كان بعد المضاربة

V.

Fol. 30^{vo}. Exod. xv. 1-3.

وبعد ذلك قال فعند ذلك مجّد موسى وبنو اسرائيل فهذه السورة وقالوا مجّد
بنا السيّد فَإِنَّه تعظّم وشرف وأغرق الفرس وراكبه فى البحر فرّبى السيّد
الذى صار مسلماً هذا امجّده والله اتى أعظّمه السيّد قاتل كالرجل القادر وفى
السفر الخامس اعلّموا ان السيّد الذى هو نار أكل

قال ابو محمد رضى هذه سَوَاءٌ من السَوَات ان يشبهه الله تع بالرجل
القادر وإن يخبر بأنه نار أكل هذه مصيبة لا تنجى ولقد قال لى بعضهم
فى هذا أليس فى كتابكم الله نور السموات والارض قلت نعم وقد قال رسول
الله صلّم اذ سأله ابو ذر هل رأيت ربك قال نورا انا اراه وهذا بيّن أنه لم
يعن النور المرئى لكن نور لا يرى فلاح أن معنى نور السموات والارض اذ قد
ثبت أنه ليس هو النور المرئى الملوّن وصحّ بأنه اراد بأنه نور السموات والارض
أنه الهادى لاهلها فقط وأن النور من اسمائه تع فقط وأما قوله تع مَثَل
نوره كمشكاة لم تمسسه نار وانه شبه نوره الذى يهدى به الى ¹

¹ Illegible, but probably الحياة.

بالمصباح الذى ذكر فينا شبة مخلوقا بخلق وبيان ذلك قوله تع متصلا
بكلام المذكور فى الآية نفسها نور على نور يهدى الله لنوره من يشاء

Then Moses and the children of Israel sang a praise, and this is the *Sūra*¹: Praised be the Lord by us, for he is mighty and exalted; he has drowned the horse and its rider in the sea. My Lord is he who has been [our] saviour, whom I will praise, and the Lord whom I will extol; the Lord who killeth, like the strong man of war. In the fifth Book he says: The Lord is a devouring fire.

Says Abu Mohammed: It is a grievous turpitude to compare Allāh to a mighty man, and to say that he is a devouring fire is most unlucky. One of them (the Jews) asked me concerning this point: "Does not your book (the *Qorān*) contain the passage, 'Allāh is the light of the heavens and the earth (*Qor. xxiv. 35*)?' " I answered: "Yes!" But when Abu Darr² asked the messenger of God, "Hast thou not seen thy Lord?" the latter replied, "I see a light." It is, however, clear that the verse in question does not allude to a visible fire, but to an invisible one. The meaning of "The light of the heavens and the earth"—as soon as it is certain that this is not a visible fire which has a colour—is to describe a "light of the heavens and the earth" which guides its inhabitants and nothing else. "Light" is one of God's attributes only, as are the words of (the same verse): "His light is compared to a lamp . . . no fire touched it." God compares his guiding light to the "lamps" mentioned by him. He likens one created thing to another, as he points out in the words that follow in the same verse: "Light upon light, Allāh guides whomsoever he wishes to his light."

VI.

Fol. 57^{ro}.

برهان هذا ان فى سفر يوشع ابن نون باقراهم أن بنى روبان وبنى غاد
ونصف سبط منشا اذ رجعوا بعد فتح بلاد الأردن وفلسطين الى بلادهم
بشرقى الأردن بنوا مذبحا فهم يوشع وسائر بنى اسرائيل يغزوهم من اجل
ذلك حتى ارسلوا اليه اننا لم نقيم لا لقربان ولا لتقديس اصلا ومعاذ الله

¹ *سورة* which Ibn Ḥazm evidently mistook for *سيرة*.

² One of Mohammed's companions who appears occasionally to have shown a certain scepticism.

ان نَتَّخِذَ موضعَ تقدّيسٍ غيرَ الموضعِ الذى فيه السرادقُ وبِيتُ اللهِ فحِينُئذٍ كَفَ عَنْهُمْ فَفِى دُونَ هَذَا كَفَايَةٌ لِمَنْ عَقَلَ فِى أَنَّهَا كِتَابٌ مُبَدَّلٌ مَكْذُوبٌ مَوْضُوعٌ وَدِينٌ مَوْضُوعٌ بِمُخَالَفِ الدِّينِ الَّذِى يُقَرَّرُونَ أَنَّ مُوسَى عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ اتَّاهَمَ بِهِ وَمَا يَرِيدُ الشَّيْطَانُ مِنْ اتِّبَاعِهِ أَكْثَرُ مِنْ هَذَا وَلَا فِى الضَّلَالِ فَوْقَ هَذَا وَنَعُوذُ بِاللَّهِ مِنَ الْخُذْلَانِ وَابْنُ فَانَّ التَّوْرَةَ الَّتِى تَرْجُمُهَا السَّبْعُونَ شَيْخًا لِبَطْلَمُوسَ الْمَلِكِ بَعْدَ ظُهُورِ التَّوْرَةِ وَنَسُومَا هِىَ مُخَالَفَةٌ لِلَّتِى كَتَبَهَا لَهُمْ عَزْرَا الْوَرَّاقُ وَتَدَّعَى النَّصَارَى أَنَّ تِلْكَ الَّتِى تَرْجُمُ السَّبْعُونَ شَيْخًا فِيهَا أَخْلَافُ أَسْنَانٍ إِلَّا مَا بَيْنَ آدَمَ وَنُوحٍ عَلَيْهِمَا السَّلَامُ الَّذِى مِنْ أَجْلِ ذَلِكَ الْاِخْتِلَافُ مَوْلَدٌ بَيْنَ تَأْرِخِ الْيَهُودِ وَبَيْنَ تَارِيخِ النَّصَارَى زِيَادَةُ الْفِى عَامٍ وَنَبِيْفٌ عَلَى مَا نَذَكَرَ بَعْدَ هَذَا أَنَّ شَاءَ اللَّهُ فَإِنَّ هَذَا كَذَلِكَ فَقَدْ وَضَحَ الْبَقِيَّةَ فَكُذِبَ السَّبْعِينَ شَيْخًا وَتَعَدَّمَهُمُ لِمَقْلِ الْبَاطِلِ وَهُمْ الَّذِينَ عَنْهُمْ أَخَذُوا دِينَهُمْ وَأَفَّ آفَ لَدِينٍ أَخَذَ عَنْ مَنْ تَيَقَّنَ كُذْبَهُ وَأَيْضًا فَانَّ فِى السَّفَرِ الْخَامِسِ مِنْ أَسْفَارِ التَّوْرَةِ الَّذِى يَسْمُوْنَهُ التَّكْرَارَ أَنَّ اللَّهَ تَعَالَى قَالَ لِمُوسَى اصْنَعْ لَوْحَيْنِ عَلَى مِثَالِ الْوَلَّيْنِ وَاصْعَدْ إِلَى الْجَبَلِ وَاعْمَلْ تَابُوتًا مِنْ حَشَبٍ لَا كُتِّبَ فِى اللَّوْحَيْنِ الْعَشَرِ كَلِمَاتٍ الَّتِى أَسْمَعُكُمْ السَّيِّدُ فِى الْجَبَلِ مِنْ وَسْطِ الْهَلِيْبِ عِنْدَ اجْتِمَاعِكُمْ إِلَيْهِ وَيَرَى بِهِمَا إِلَى فَاَنْصَرَفَتْ مِنَ الْجَبَلِ وَجَعَلْتُهُمَا فِى التَّاتُوتِ فَهَمَا فِيهِ إِلَى الْيَوْمِ

VII.

Al Jâhiz. Cod. Brit. Mus. Or. 3138,

Fol. 145^{vo}.

قَالُوا فَانَّ فِيهَا إِسْرَائِيلَ بِكَرَى وَجَمِيعَ مَا ذَكَرْتُمْ عِنَّا مَعْرُوفٌ فِى الْكُتُبِ قُلْنَا إِنَّ الْقَوْمَ أَنَّمَا أَتَوْا مِنْ قَلَّةٍ الْمَعْرِفَةَ بِوُجُوهِ الْكَلَامِ وَمِنْ سُوءِ التَّرْجُمَةِ مَعَ الْحُكْمِ بِمَا يَسْبِقُ إِلَى الْقُلُوبِ وَلَعَمْرَى أَنَّ لَوْ كَانَتْ لَهُمْ عَقُولُ الْمُسْلِمِينَ وَمَعْرِفَتُهُمْ بِمَا تَجُوزُ فِى كَلَامِ الْعَرَبِ وَمَا يَجُوزُ عَلَى اللَّهِ مَعَ فَصَاحَتِهِمْ بِالْعِبْرَانِيَةِ لَوَجَدُوا لَذَلِكَ الْكَلَامَ تَأْوِيلًا حَسَنًا وَمَخْرَجًا سَهْلًا وَوَجْهًا قَرِيبًا لَوْ كَانُوا أَيْضًا لَمْ يَعْطَلُوا فِى سَائِرِ مَا تَرْجُمُوا لَكَانَ لِقَائِلُ مَقَالٍ وَلِطَاعِنُ مَدْخَلٍ وَلَكِنَّهُمْ يُخْبِرُونَ أَنَّ اللَّهَ تَبَارَكَ وَتَعَالَى قَالَ فِى الْعَشْرَايَاتِ الَّتِى كَتَبْتُهَا أَصَابِعَ اللَّهِ إِنِّى أَنَا اللَّهُ الشَّدِيدُ وَإِنِّى أَنَا اللَّهُ الشَّقِيفُ وَأَنَا النَّارُ الَّتِى أَكَلَ النَّيِّرَانِ أَخَذَ الْإِبْنَانِ لِحُوبِ الْآبَا الْقَرْنِ الْأَوَّلِ وَالثَّانِىِ وَالثَّلَاثِ إِلَى السَّابِعِ وَأَنَّ دَاوُدَ قَالَ فِى الزَّبُورِ افْتَحْ عَيْنَكَ يَا رَبِّ

وقم يا رب واصنع الّٰى سمعك يا رب وان داود خبّر ايضا فى مكان آخر عن الله تعالى وانتبه الله كما ينتبه السكران الذى قد شرب الخمر وان موسى قال فى التوراة خلق الله الاشياء بكلمته وبروح نفسه وان الله قال فى التوراة لبني اسرائيل ذراعى الشديد اخرجكم من اهل مصر وانه قال فى كتاب اشعيا احمد الله حمداً جديداً احمده فى اقاصى الارض يملأ الجزائر وسكانها والبحور والقفار وما فيها ويكون بنو قيدار فى القصور وسكان لجبال يعنى قيدار ابن (80) اسمعيل يصيحوا ويصبروا الله الفخر والكرامة ويلبسون بحمد الله فى الجزائر وانه قال على اثر ذلك ويحىي الرب الجبار والرجل الشجاع المحرب ويزجر ويصرخ ويهيج الحرب والحمية ويقتل اعداءه يفرح السماء والارض وان الله قال ايضا فى كتاب اشعيا سكنت قال هو متى اسكت مثل المرأة التى قد اخذها الطلق للولادة ألتهم وان ترانى اريد احرق الجبال والشعب واخذ بالعرب فى طريق لا يعرفونه وكلهم على هذا اللفظ العربى مجمع ومعنى هذا لا يجوز احد من اهل العلم ومثل هذا كثير تركته لمعرفةكم به وانت تعلم ان اليهود لو اخذوا القرآن فترجموه بالعبرانية لخرجوه من معانيه وحلوله عن وجوهه وما ظنك بهم اذا ترجموا آسفونا انتقمنا منهم ولتصنع على عيني السموات مطويات بيمينه وعلى

العرش استوى وناصرة الى ربها ناظرة وقوله فلما تجلى ربّه للجبل جعله دكا وكلم الله موسى تكليما وجاء ربك والملك صفا صفا وقد تعلم ان مفسرى كتابنا واصحاب التناويل منا احسن معرفة واعلم بوجوه الكلام من اليهود ومتأولى الكتب ونحن قد نجد فى تفسيرهم ما لا يجوز على الله فى صفته ولا عند المتكلمين فى مقائسهم ولا عند النحويين فى عربيتهم فما ظنك باليهود مع غباوتهم وغيهم وقلة نظرهم وتقليدهم